Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.: 2012.1553E
Project Title: 1174-1178 Folsom Street
Zoning/Plan Area: Folsom NCT (Folsom Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District
                      65-X Height and Bulk District
                      Western SoMa Community Plan
Block/Lot: 3730/023, 024
Lot Size: 2 lots totaling 8,000 square feet
Project Sponsor: Erik Liu; 1178Folsom LLC
                 (415) 314-8700
Staff Contact: Brett Becker, (415) 554-1650, Brett.Becker@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes the following: 1) merging two 4,000-square-foot lots; 2) demolition of two existing one- and two-story warehouse/office buildings which total 9,600 square feet; and 3) construction of a new six-story, 65-foot tall, 42,781-square-foot mixed-use building with basement garage. The existing buildings were built circa 1952/1970 and are located within the eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District.

The new building would be constructed on a slab foundation and would include 3,990 square feet of retail space on the ground floor, 5,988 square feet of office space on the second floor, and 14,758 square feet of residential space with 42 single-room occupancy (SRO) dwelling units on the remaining floors. The 5,942 square-foot basement level garage would involve up to 14 feet of soil disturbance and would require the excavation of approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soil. The garage would be accessed from Clementina Street and would contain 9 off-street vehicle parking spaces, 48 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 6 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The project would provide private open space for six dwelling units and approximately 1,658 square feet of common useable open space via a roof deck and court terrace for the remaining dwelling units. The project site is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area on the block bound by Clementina, 8th, Folsom, and Rausch Streets.

The block of Folsom Street between 7th and 8th Streets, on which the project site is located, consists of retail, residential, commercial, and office uses. The surrounding buildings vary in appearance and height; the existing two story buildings are generally industrial in character and consist of masonry construction, while the taller four- to six-story buildings are of more modern appearance characterized by stucco, steel, and glass. Several tall five- to six-story residential buildings line both sides of the Folsom Street block, interspersed with the low-rise industrial-style buildings. The existing warehouse/office buildings on the project site are currently being used for office and storage space. Immediate surrounding properties to the project site along Folsom Street include commercial/warehouse buildings and a five-story 65-foot tall multi-family residential building. The project site is located within 25 feet of a Historic District.
contributor (three-and-a-half-story, Queen Anne Style, wood frame residential building) at 675-679 Clementina Street (one building away from the project site).

**Project Approval**

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Conditional Use Authorization** *(Planning Commission)*
- **Variance** *(Planning Department)*
- **Building Permit** *(Department of Building Inspection)*

The proposed project is subject to Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission, which is the Approval Action for the project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
FIGURE 1: PROJECT LOCATION

FIGURE 2: PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN – FOLSOM STREET
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project (Western SoMa PEIR). The CPE Checklist indicates whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Western SoMa PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report. If no such topics are identified, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

---

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are listed at the end of this document.

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant impacts related to transportation and circulation, cultural and paleontological resources, wind and shadow, noise and vibration, air quality, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to shadow, transportation and circulation, cultural and paleontological resources, air quality, and noise. Aside from shadow, mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced said impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at three intersections; and cumulative transit impacts on several Muni lines), cultural and paleontological resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historic resources), noise (cumulative noise impacts), air quality (program-level TACs and PM$_{2.5}$ pollutant impacts, program-level and cumulative criteria air pollutant impacts).

The proposed project would include construction of a 65-foot-tall mixed-use residential building containing 42 SRO dwelling units, 3,990 square feet of retail space, 5,988 square feet of office space, and a basement parking garage. As discussed below in this checklist, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

**AESTHETICS AND PARKING IMPACTS FOR TRANSIT PRIORITY INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that, “aesthetics and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. Project design details are included in the project description, and an assessment of parking demand is included in the Transportation section for informational purposes.

---

2 San Francisco Planning Department. Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 1174-1178 Folsom Street, March 11, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
Community Plan Exemption Checklist

1174-1178 Folsom Street
Case No. 2012.1553E

Topics:

1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:
   a) Physically divide an established community?

   The Western SoMa PEIR determined that adoption of the Western SoMa Community Plan would not result in a significant impact related to land use and would not result in a cumulative loss of production, distribution, and repair (PDR) uses. The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that future development under the Community Plan would result in more cohesive neighborhoods and would include more clearly defined residential, commercial, and industrial areas. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

   Furthermore, the Citywide Planning and Neighborhood Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the Folsom Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) District and is consistent with the height, density, and land uses as specified in the Western SoMa Community Plan, maintaining the mixed character of the area by encouraging residential and commercial development.3,4

   For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR related to land use and land use planning.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:
   a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

   3 Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning Analysis, 1174-1178 Folsom Street, March 25, 2014. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.

   4 Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1174-1178 Folsom Street, January 30, 2015. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
One of the objectives of the Western SoMa Community Plan is to identify appropriate locations for housing to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Area is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the rezoning and that any population increase would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, but would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the Community Plan project area. The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project’s residential, retail, and office uses would be expected to add approximately 42 residents and 33 employees to the site, respectively. Demolition of the existing warehouse/office buildings would remove existing manufacturing uses and associated employees (approximately 17). These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the Western SoMa Community Plan, and evaluated in the Western SoMa PEIR.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on population and housing that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.
Historic Architectural Resources

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource through demolition.

Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a: Documentation of a Historic Resource, M-CP-1b: Oral Histories, and M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program require methods to document historic resources for individual projects that would demolish these resources. The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing warehouse/office buildings and construction of a six-story, 65-foot tall mixed-use building. The existing buildings were built circa 1952/1970 and are located within the eligible Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District (Historic District). This Historic District developed primarily between the years 1906 and 1936 and consists of a group of resources that are cohesive in regard to scale, building typology, materials, architectural style, and relationship to the street. As such, a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) was prepared for the project to assess impacts to historic resources. According to the HRER, neither of these buildings would qualify as a historic resource and were determined to be non-contributors to the Historic District since they were built after the period of significance of the Historic District and have low architectural value. Further, the HRER found that the proposed design of the new building would be compatible with the Historic District and would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Historic District. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a historic resource impact and Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a, M-CP-1b, and M-CP-1c would not apply to the proposed project.

The Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR identified potential construction impacts related to substantial damage to ofsite historic architectural resources. The Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR identified two mitigation measures that would reduce historic architectural resource impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities and M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources require implementation of protection methods and a monitoring program during construction in order to minimize construction-related vibration effects on nearby historic buildings. For purposes of these measures, nearby historic buildings would include those within 100 feet of a construction site if pile driving would be used or those within 25 feet of a construction site if heavy equipment would be used. The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing warehouse/office buildings and construction of a new six-story mixed-use building. The project site is located within 25 feet of a Historic District contributor (three-and-a-half-
story, Queen Anne Style, wood frame residential building) at 675-679 Clementina Street (one building away from the project site), and construction of the project may involve heavy equipment that could potentially affect the nearby historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to construction-related historic architectural resource impacts, and would be subject to Mitigation Measures M-CP-7a and M-CP-7b (identified in this document as Project Mitigation Measures 1 and 2, respectively) requiring implementation of protection methods and a monitoring program during construction in order to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on historic architectural resources that were not identified in the Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR.

**Archaeological Resources**

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Community Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified two mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than-significant-level. Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment and M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources apply to projects involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation to a depth of five or more feet below grade. As the proposed project at 1174-1178 Folsom Street would involve up to 14 feet of soil disturbance to construct an underground parking garage, Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a and M-CP-4b apply to the project.

As part of project implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a, the Planning Department’s archeologist conducted a Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) of the project site and the proposed project. The PAR determined that the project would have the potential to adversely affect an archeological resource. Therefore, in accordance with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a, the project sponsor would be required to prepare an Archeological Testing Program to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b to reduce potential impacts from accidental discovery of buried archeological resources during project construction to a less-than-significant level. Western SoMa Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a and M-CP-4b are detailed at the end of this document as Project Mitigation Measure 3 and Project Mitigation Measure 4, respectively. The project would not result in significant impacts related to archeological resources with implementation of these mitigation measures.

For the reasons above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on cultural and paleontological resources that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

---

6 Environmental Planning Preliminary Archeological Review: Checklist for 1174-1178 Folsom Street from Allison Vanderslice, March 27, 2014. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, emergency access, or construction. As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists, emergency access, or construction beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR. Transportation system improvements included as part of the Western SoMa Plan were identified to have significant impacts related to loading, but the impact was reduced to less-than-significant with mitigation.

The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that adoption of the Western SoMa Community Plan could result in significant impacts on traffic, transit, and loading, and identified four transportation mitigation measures. One mitigation measure reduced loading impacts to less-than-significant. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse traffic impacts and the cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Community Plan Exemption Checklist topic 4c is not applicable.

**Trip Generation**

The proposed project involves construction of a six-story, mixed-use building containing 42 SRO dwelling units, 3,990 square feet of retail space, 5,988 square feet of office space, and a basement parking...
garage. 48 secured bicycle parking spaces and six sidewalk bicycle racks would be provided. The project would provide up to 9 parking spaces in an underground garage.

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department. The proposed project would generate an estimated 1,076 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 372 person trips by auto, 233 transit trips, 352 walk trips and 118 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 27 vehicle trips (accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract).

Traffic

The proposed project’s vehicle trips would travel through the intersections surrounding the project block. Intersection operating conditions are characterized by the concept of Level of Service (LOS), which ranges from A to F and provides a description of an intersection’s performance based on traffic volumes, intersection capacity, and vehicle delays. LOS A represents free flow conditions, with little or no delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions, with extremely long delays; LOS D (moderately high delays) is considered the lowest acceptable level in San Francisco.

The intersections near the project site, including Sixth/Bryant Streets, Seventh/Mission Streets, Seventh/Folsom Streets, Seventh/Harrison Streets, Eighth/Bryant Streets, Ninth/Mission Streets, Ninth/Folsom Street, Ninth/Harrison Streets, and Ninth/Bryant Streets, are currently operating and would continue to operate acceptably (at LOS D or better) during the PM peak hour (see Table 1 – Intersection Level of Service).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>Study Intersection</th>
<th>Existing P.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>Cumulative (2030) P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fifth/ Bryant/ I-80 Eastbound on-ramp</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sixth Street/ Bryant Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sixth Street/ Brannan/ I-280 ramps</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seventh Street/ Mission Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seventh Street/ Folsom Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seventh/ Harrison/ I-80 Westbound on-ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eighth Street/ Howard Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eighth Street/ Folsom Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eighth/Harrison/ I-80 Westbound off-ramp</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eighth Street/ Bryant Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ninth Street/ Mission Street</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ninth Street/ Folsom Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ninth Street/ Harrison Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 1174-1178 Folsom Street, June 12, 2013. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
The proposed project would generate an estimated 27 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that could travel through surrounding intersections. This amount of new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at these or other nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, and would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 27 new p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by Western SoMa Community Plan projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2030 cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on traffic that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

**Transit**

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12 and 19. The proposed project would be expected to generate 233 daily transit trips, including 29 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 29 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

The Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR identified less than significant impacts relating to exceedance of the capacity utilization standards for Muni lines or regional transit providers, or a substantial increase in delays or operating costs.

The proposed project’s minor contribution of 29 PM peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall transit volume generated by Western SoMa Community Plan area projects. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative transit conditions and thus, the proposed project would not result in any significant direct or cumulative transit impacts that were not identified in the PEIR.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR related to transit.

**Parking**

Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that, “aesthetics and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”
Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

a) The project is in a transit priority area;
b) The project is on an infill site; and
c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this determination does not consider the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.\textsuperscript{8} The Planning Department acknowledges that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and the decision makers. Therefore, the following parking demand analysis is provided for informational purposes only.

The parking demand for the new residential, retail, and office uses associated with the proposed project was determined based on the methodology presented in the Transportation Guidelines. On an average weekday, the demand for parking would be for 64 spaces. The proposed project would provide 9 off-street spaces. Thus, as proposed, the project would have an unmet parking demand of an estimated 55 spaces. At this location, the unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces within a reasonable distance of the project vicinity. Additionally, the project site is well served by public transit and bicycle facilities. Therefore, any unmet parking demand associated with the project would not materially affect the overall parking conditions in the project vicinity such that hazardous conditions or significant delays would be created.

Further, the project site is located in a Neighborhood Commercial Transit zoning district where under Section 151 of the Planning Code, the proposed project would not be required to provide any off-street parking spaces. It should be noted that the Planning Commission has the discretion to adjust the number of on-site parking spaces included in the proposed project, typically at the time that the project entitlements are sought. The Planning Commission may not support the parking ratio proposed. In some cases, particularly when the proposed project is in a transit rich area, the Planning Commission may not support the provision of any off-street parking spaces. This is, in part, owing to the fact that the parking spaces are not ‘bundled’ with the residential units. In other words, residents would have the option to rent or purchase a parking space, but one would not be automatically provided with the residential unit.

If the project were ultimately approved with no off-street parking spaces, the proposed project would have an unmet demand of 64 spaces. As mentioned above, the unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces nearby and through alternative modes such as public transit and bicycle facilities. Given that the unmet demand could be met by existing facilities and given that the proposed project site is well-served by transit and bicycle facilities, a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces associated with the proposed project, even if no off-street spaces are provided, would not result in significant delays or hazardous conditions.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of

\textsuperscript{8} San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 1174-1178 Folsom Street, March 11, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
travel. While parking conditions change over time, a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project that creates hazardous conditions or significant delays to traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians could adversely affect the physical environment. Whether a shortfall in parking creates such conditions will depend on the magnitude of the shortfall and the ability of drivers to change travel patterns or switch to other travel modes. If a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions or significant delays in travel, such a condition could also result in secondary physical environmental impacts (e.g., air quality or noise impacts caused by congestion), depending on the project and its setting.

The absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service or other modes (walking and biking), would be in keeping with the City’s “Transit First” policy and numerous San Francisco General Plan Policies, including those in the Transportation Element. The City’s Transit First Policy, established in the City’s Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provides that “parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation.”

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area, and thus choose to reach their destination by other modes (i.e. walking, biking, transit, taxi). If this occurs, any secondary environmental impacts that may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, would reasonably address potential secondary effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Western SoMa PEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noise-generating uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. In addition, the Western SoMa PEIR noted that implementation of the Community Plan would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Plan Area and result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Western SoMa PEIR therefore identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses requires a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA \( (L_{dn}^{10}) \), where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses requires a noise analysis for new residential development and development that includes other noise-sensitive uses in order to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. The proposed project would construct a new six-story residential mixed-use building—a noise sensitive use—in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA \( (L_{dn}) \). Accordingly, the project sponsor has conducted an environmental noise study demonstrating that the proposed project can feasibly attain acceptable interior noise levels consistent with Title 24.\(^{11}\)

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses requires a noise analysis for new development including commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project vicinity in order to reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses. The proposed project includes retail use on the ground floor that could be considered a noise-generating use. The project’s environmental noise

---

\(^{9}\) The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. A 10-dBA increase in the level of a continuous noise represents a perceived doubling of loudness.

\(^{10}\) The \( L_{dn} \) is the \( L_{eq} \), or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period with a 10 dB penalty applied to noise levels between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The \( L_{eq} \) is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.

study concluded that the proposed retail use would be able to comply with the use compatibility requirements in the San Francisco General Plan and Police Code Section 2909, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and there would be no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed retail use.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments requires that new open space associated with new development that includes noise-sensitive uses be protected from existing ambient noise levels in order to minimize disruption to users of the open space. The proposed project’s new residential units would be considered a noise-sensitive use. As part of project implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d, an environmental noise study was prepared demonstrating that open space associated with the residential units could be protected from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space since the site design uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources. As the project proposes a noise-sensitive use with provision of open space, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d would apply to the project, and is detailed as Project Mitigation Measure 5 at the end of this document.

Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures and M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving require implementation of noise controls during construction in order to reduce construction-related noise impacts. The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing warehouse/office buildings and construction of a new six-story mixed-use building, and therefore, would contribute to construction-related noise impacts. Since the proposed slab foundation would not require pile driving and would avoid vibration effects typically generated by pile-driving activities, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would not apply to the proposed project. However, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a—detailed under Project Mitigation Measure 6—in order to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (occurring over the course of approximately 12 months) would be subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA\(^\text{12}\) \((\text{L}_{\text{dn}}\text{\textsuperscript{13}})\) at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of DPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

\(^{12}\)The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. A 10-dBA increase in the level of a continuous noise represents a perceived doubling of loudness.

\(^{13}\)The \(L_{\text{dn}}\) is the \(L_{\text{eq}}\), or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period with a 10 dB penalty applied to noise levels between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The \(L_{\text{eq}}\) is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.
DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately seven months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site and may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary (approximately seven months), intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be subject to and would comply with the Noise Ordinance. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would reduce any construction-related noise effects on nearby residences to the greatest extent feasible.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Community Plan Exemption Checklist topics 5e and 5f are not applicable.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to violation of an air quality standard, uses that emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM), and construction emissions. The Western SoMa PEIR identified five mitigation measures that would help reduce air quality impacts; however, they would not be able to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects is required for projects generating more than 3,500 vehicle trips resulting in excessive criteria pollutant emissions. The proposed project would generate approximately 214 daily vehicle trips. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 would not apply to the proposed project.
For determining potential health risk impacts, San Francisco has partnered with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco and identify portions of the City in which there are additional health risks for affected populations (“Air Pollutant Exposure Zone”). The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone was identified based on two health based criteria:

1. Excess cancer risk from all sources > 100 per one million persons; and
2. PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations from all sources including ambient >10µg/m$^3$.

Sensitive receptors within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone are more at risk for adverse health effects from exposure to substantial air pollutant concentrations than sensitive receptors located outside the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. These locations (i.e., within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone) require additional consideration when projects or activities have the potential to emit TACs, including DPM emissions from temporary and variable construction activities.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors and Article 38 of the San Francisco Health Code require new residential development in areas of poor air quality and near high-volume roadways to be equipped with filtration systems with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating of 13 or higher, as necessary to reduce outdoor-to-indoor infiltration of air pollutants by 80 percent, which would minimize exposure of future residents to DPM and other pollutant emissions, as well as odors. Since the proposed project would include the addition of 42 residential units in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, the project would be required to install air filters in all residential units that will reduce PM$_{2.5}$ by 80% to comply with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 and Article 38. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 would apply to the proposed project, as detailed under Project Mitigation Measure 7 at the end of this document.

The BAAQMD, the regional agency with jurisdiction over the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), provided updated 2011 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines), which provided new methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts, including construction activities. The Air Quality Guidelines provide screening criteria for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions may violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. If a project meets the screening criteria, then the project would have less-than-significant air quality impacts; the lead agency or applicant would thus not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of the proposed project’s air pollutant emissions from construction or operations.

Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM$_{2.5}$ or DPM and Other TACs involves the siting of commercial, industrial, or other uses that emit TACs as part of everyday operations. The project

---

14 PM$_{2.5}$ is defined as particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter, often called “fine” particles.
15 A microgram per cubic meter (µg/m$^3$) is a derived System International measurement unit of density—measuring volume in cubic meters—used to estimate weight or mass in micrograms.
16 The BAAQMD considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) Residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.
17 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011.
proposes construction of a six-story, mixed-use building containing 42 SRO dwelling units, 3,990 square feet of retail space, and 5,988 square feet of office space; the project would not generate more than 10,000 vehicle trips per day, 1,000 truck trips per day, or include a new stationary source, items that would emit TACs as part of everyday operations. The project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and the proposed project would result in an increase in construction- and operational-related criteria air pollutants including from the generation of daily vehicle trips and energy demand. The proposed project meets the screening criteria provided in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (May 2011) for construction- and operational-related criteria air pollutants. Thus, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants and M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards require projects to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. For projects with construction activities located in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, compliance with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-6 and M-AQ-7 would require submittal of a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the Environmental Review Officer for review and approval. The project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Construction activities from the proposed project would result in DPM and other TACs from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction would last approximately seven months, and diesel-generating equipment would be required for the duration of the project’s construction phase. Therefore, the proposed project’s temporary and variable construction activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM and other TACs that would add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-AQ-6 and M-AQ-7 are applicable to the proposed project, and are detailed in Project Mitigation Measures 8 and 9, respectively. Compliance with these mitigation measures would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts from construction vehicles and equipment.

To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Construction activities from the proposed project would result in dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, which would ensure that these impacts would remain less than significant.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on air quality that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.
## 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Western SoMa PEIR assessed the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions that could result from implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan. The PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from plan implementation would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Regulations outlined in San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions have proven effective as San Francisco’s GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded EO S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy. Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through AB 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project’s contribution to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and thus the proposed project’s contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable or generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on GHG emissions beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

## 8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wind

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would have a potentially significant impact related to the alteration of wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. However, the PEIR determined that this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind
Analysis and Wind Testing, which would require a wind analysis for any new structures within the Community Plan area that have a proposed height of 80 feet or taller.

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally the case that projects under 80 feet in height would not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The proposed 65-foot-tall mixed-use residential building would be similar in height to existing buildings in the area, and thus the project would not contribute to the significant wind impact identified in the Western SoMa PEIR because the proposed structure would not rise substantially above nearby buildings and would not exceed 80 feet in height. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-WS-1 would not apply to the proposed project.

For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR related to wind.

**Shadow**

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Plan and Rezoning of the Adjacent Parcels would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to the creation of new shadows in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. The proposed project would demolish two existing one- and two-story warehouse/office buildings building and construct a six-story, approximately 65-foot tall mixed-use residential building. To determine whether the proposed project would conform to Section 295, the Planning Department conducted a preliminary shadow fan analysis. The preliminary shadow fan analysis determined that the project would not cast shadows on any public open spaces or recreational resources, including but not limited to parks under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Therefore, the project would not contribute to the significant shadow impact identified in the Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR.

For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa Community Plan PEIR related to shadow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. RECREATION—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The limited increase of population in the vicinity due to the proposed project would not substantially increase the use and deterioration of the local recreational facilities nor require construction of new or expansion of facilities. As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☒

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☒

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☒

d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements? ☒

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? ☒

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☒

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☒

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population in the Plan area would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.
11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population in the Plan area would not result in a significant impact to public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development project under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☒ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
As discussed in the Western SoMa PEIR, the Western SoMa Community Plan Area is almost fully developed with buildings and other improvements such as streets and parking lots. Most of the project area consists of structures that have been in industrial use for many years. As a result, landscaping and other vegetation is sparse, except for a few parks. Because future development projects in the Western SoMa Community Plan would largely consist of new construction of mixed-uses in these heavily built-out former industrial neighborhoods, vegetation loss or disturbance of wildlife other than common urban species would be minimal. Therefore, the Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant effects related to riparian habitat, wetlands, movement of migratory species, local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or habitat conservation plans.

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the Western SoMa Community Plan would result in significant but mitigable impacts on special-status birds and bats that may be nesting in trees or roosting in buildings that are proposed for removal/demolition as part of an individual project. As identified in the PEIR, Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys and M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a requires that conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction of projects within the Western SoMa Community Plan area include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b requires pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing one- and two-story warehouse/office buildings, and therefore would contribute to this significant impact. Therefore, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a and M-BI-1b requiring pre-construction special-status bird and bat surveys to be conducted prior to demolition in order to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a and M-BI-1b are detailed at the end of this document as Project Mitigation Measures 10 and 11, respectively.

As the proposed project includes the above mitigation measures and is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on biological resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.
Topics:

13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?

The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced groundshaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risk, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Therefore, the PEIR concluded that the project would not result in significant impacts related to geological hazards. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The project would be required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. Therefore, potential damage to structures from geologic hazards such as landslide hazards and seismic stability of the project site would be addressed through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical or other subsurface report and review of the building permit application pursuant to its implementation of the Building Code. A geotechnical report was prepared for the
proposed project which provided recommendations for final building design. The report concluded that there were no unusual geology and soil conditions at the project site. The proposed project would comply with the recommendations of this geotechnical review by incorporating the recommendations into the final building design subject to DBI review.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>❒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Rockridge Geotechnical, “Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residential Building 1174 and 1178 Folsom Street”, June 28, 2013. This document is on file and available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The project site is entirely covered by impervious surfaces and the proposed building and courtyard areas would fully occupy the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface area on the site, which in turn would not increase the amount of runoff and drainage. In accordance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 83-10), the proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines, incorporating Low Impact Design (LID) approaches and stormwater management systems into the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect runoff and drainage.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

---

15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—
Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
The Western SoMa PEIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the potential for the Plan or subsequent development projects within the Plan area to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan, and the potential for subsequent projects to expose people or structures to a significant risk with respect to fires.

**Hazardous Building Materials**

The proposed project would involve demolition of the existing one- and two-story warehouse/office buildings on the project site, which was built circa 1952. Because this structure was built before the 1970s, hazardous building materials such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, asbestos and lead-based paint are likely to be present in this structure. Demolishing the existing structure could expose workers or the community to hazardous building materials. In compliance with the Western SoMa PEIR, the project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement, identified as Project Mitigation Measure 12 before demolition of the existing structure, which would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR related to hazardous building materials.

**Handling of Potentially Contaminated Soils**

The Western SoMa PEIR identified potentially significant impacts related to exposing the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of subsequent projects within the Plan Area. The PEIR determined that Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors amended Health Code Article 22A, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and is also known as the Maher Ordinance. Amendments to the Maher Ordinance became effective August 24, 2013, and require that sponsors for projects that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3 of the Western SoMa PEIR related to contaminated soil and groundwater is therefore superseded by the Maher Ordinance.
The proposed project is located on the Maher Map\(^{19}\) and would excavate up to 14 feet below grade and approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soil. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH and a Phase I ESA has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination.\(^{20}\) The Phase I found no evidence of the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release into structures on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water. The Phase I did not find any physical or documentary evidence of any use, storage or disposal of any chemicals, hazardous materials, reportable substances or hazardous waste at the site. No Recognized Environmental Concerns are associated with the property and none were identified in the nearby areas.

Through compliance with Article 22A of the Health Code, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR related to hazardous soil and/or groundwater.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

---

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—

Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

---

\(^{19}\) The Maher Map identifies sites that are known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater.

\(^{20}\) AEI Consultants. July 15, 2010. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 1174-1178 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. This document is on file for review as part of Case File No. 2012.1553E.
The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the Community Plan would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner or in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The Plan Area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the Community Plan would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.
The Western SoMa PEIR determined that no agricultural or forest resources exist in the Plan Area; therefore the Western SoMa Community Plan would have no effect on agricultural and forest resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1 - Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities (Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a of the Western SoMa PEIR)

The project sponsor of a development project in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels shall consult with Planning Department environmental planning/preservation staff to determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those within 100 feet of a construction site if pile driving would be used in a subsequent development project; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if heavy equipment would be used on the subsequent development project. (No measures need be applied if no heavy equipment would be employed.) If one or more historical resources is identified that could be adversely affected, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings (as identified by the Planning Department preservation staff), using construction techniques that reduce vibration, appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.

Project Mitigation Measure 2 - Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources (Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b of the Western SoMa PEIR)

For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a, and where heavy equipment would be used on a subsequent development project, the project sponsor of such a project shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings’ existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard.
Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.

**Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Archeological Testing Program (Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a of the Western SoMa PEIR)**

Project sponsors wishing to obtain building permits from the City are required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. The San Francisco Planning Department, as the Lead Agency, requires an evaluation of the potential archeological effects of a proposed individual project. Pursuant to this evaluation, the San Francisco Planning Department has established a review procedure that may include the following actions, carried out by the Department archeologist or by a qualified archeological consultant, as retained by the project sponsor.

This archeological mitigation measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of five (5) feet or greater below ground surface and located within properties within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared.

Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. As the PAR determined that the project has the potential to adversely affect archeological resources, an Archeological Testing Program is required. The Program would more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The Archeological Testing Program is detailed below.

A. **Consultation with Descendant Communities.** On discovery of an archeological site\(^{21}\) associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group an appropriate representative\(^{22}\) of the descendant group and the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

---

\(^{21}\) The term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

\(^{22}\) An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.
B. *Archeological Testing Program.* The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

a) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or

b) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

C. *Archeological Monitoring Program.* If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological resources and to their depositional context;

- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;

- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;

If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile-driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile-driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

D. **Archeological Data Recovery Program.** The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- **Field Methods and Procedures.** Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.

- **Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.** Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.

- **Discard and Deaccession Policy.** Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.

- **Interpretive Program.** Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.

- **Security Measures.** Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.

- **Final Report.** Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.

- **Curation.** Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.
E. **Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.** The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

F. **Final Archeological Resources Report.** The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

**Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources**

*Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b of the Western SoMa PEIR*

This mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a)(c).

The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); and to utilities firms involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, and supervisory personnel. The project sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firms) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.

Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project head foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall
immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.

If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.

Measures might include preservation in situ of the archeological resource, an archeological monitoring program, or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.

The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy, and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution from that presented above.

**Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Open Space in Noisy Environments (Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d of the Western SoMa PEIR)**

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses (primarily residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-
family dwellings. Implementation of this measure shall be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

Project Mitigation Measure 6 - General Construction Noise Control Measures (Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a of the Western SoMa PEIR)

To ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible, the sponsor of a subsequent development project shall undertake the following:

- The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

- The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible.

- The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.

- The sponsor of a subsequent development project shall include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but not be limited to: performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings inasmuch as such routes are otherwise feasible.

- Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the sponsor of a subsequent development project shall submit to the San Francisco Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in
advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities generating noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity.

Project Mitigation Measure 7 – Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors (Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 of the Western SoMa PEIR)

To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors resulting from exposure to roadways, stationary sources, and other non-permitted sources of fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) and toxic air contaminants (TACs), the Planning Department shall require analysis of potential site-specific health risks for all projects that would include sensitive receptors, based on criteria as established by the San Francisco Planning Department (as determined by the ERO or his/her designee), as such criteria may be amended from time to time. For purposes of this measure, sensitive receptors are considered to include housing units; child care centers; schools (high school age and below); and inpatient health care facilities, including nursing or retirement homes and similar establishments.

Development projects in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels that would include sensitive receptors shall undergo, during the environmental review process and no later than the first project approval action, an analysis of potential health risks to new sensitive receptors, consistent with methodology approved by the San Francisco Planning Department, to determine if health risks from pollutant concentrations would exceed applicable significance thresholds as determined by the Environmental Review Officer.

If one or more thresholds would be exceeded at the site of the subsequent project where sensitive receptors would be located, the project (or portion of the project containing sensitive receptors, in the case of a mixed-use project) shall be equipped with filtration systems with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) rating of 13 or higher, as necessary to reduce outdoor-to-indoor infiltration of air pollutants by 80 percent. The ventilation system shall be designed by an engineer certified by the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Engineers, who shall provide a written report documenting that the system offers the best available technology to minimize outdoor-to-indoor transmission of air pollution. The project sponsor shall present a plan to ensure ongoing maintenance of ventilation and filtration systems and shall ensure the disclosure to buyers and/or renters regarding the findings of the analysis and inform occupants as to proper use of any installed air filtration.

Project Mitigation Measure 8 – Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6 of the Western SoMa PEIR)

A. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Subsequent development projects that may exceed the standards for criteria air pollutants, as determined by the ERO or his/her designee, shall be required to undergo an analysis of the project’s construction emissions and if, based on that analysis, construction period emissions may be significant, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants (as well as TACs, see Impact M-AQ-6 and M-AQ-7) shall be designed to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions to the greatest degree practicable. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:
a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;
b) All off-road equipment shall have:
   i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and
   ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).

c) Exceptions:
   i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.
   ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).
   iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table A1 below.

### TABLE A1
**OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP DOWN SCHEDULE***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Alternative</th>
<th>Engine Emission Standard</th>
<th>Emissions Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How to use the table. If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

**Alternative fuels are not a VDECS

---

23 Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.
2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For the VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, Air Resources Board (ARB) verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.

5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan as requested.

B. Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amount of alternative fuel used.

C. Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.

Project Mitigation Measure 9 – Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards (Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 of the Western SoMa PEIR)

To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor of each development project in the Draft Plan Area and on the Adjacent Parcels shall undertake a project-specific construction health risk analysis to be performed by a qualified air quality specialist, as appropriate and determined by the Environmental Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department, for diesel-powered and other applicable construction equipment, using the methodology recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and/or the San Francisco Planning Department. If the health risk analysis determines that construction emissions would exceed health risk significance thresholds identified by the BAAQMD and/or the San Francisco Planning Department, the project sponsor shall develop a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards designed to reduce health risks from construction equipment to less-than-significant levels.
All requirements in the Construction Emissions Minimization Plan must be included in contract specifications. The Construction Emissions Minimization Plan is described in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6, Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants.

Project Mitigation Measure 10 – Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys (Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a of the Western SoMa PEIR)
Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. If bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are found to be nesting in or near any work area, an appropriate no-work buffer zone (e.g., 100 feet for songbirds) shall be designated by the biologist. Depending on the species involved, input from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may be warranted. As recommended by the biologist, no activities shall be conducted within the no-work buffer zone that could disrupt bird breeding. Outside of the breeding season (August 16 – January 31), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed. Special-status birds that establish nests during the construction period are considered habituated to such activity and no buffer shall be required, except as needed to avoid direct destruction of the nest, which would still be prohibited.

Project Mitigation Measure 11 – Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys (Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b of the Western SoMa PEIR)
Conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction within the Draft Plan Area or on the Adjacent Parcels shall include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. If active day or night roosts are found, the bat biologist shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no disturbance buffer shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes at a distance to be determined in consultation with the CDFG. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would be necessary.

Project Mitigation Measure 12 – Hazardous Building Materials Abatement (Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2 of the Western SoMa PEIR)
The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.